UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,632	03/28/2006 Jeremy Richard Graff		X16348	9016
25885 ELI LILLY & (7590 05/01/200 COMPANY	EXAMINER		
PATENT DIVISION P.O. BOX 6288 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288			PACKARD, BENJAMIN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@lilly.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/573,632	GRAFF, JEREMY RICHARD				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Benjamin Packard	1612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Ja</u>	nuarv 2009.					
•	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	, 					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>13-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	• , ,	* *				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Application	on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	d in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	акент Аррінсавон				
· , , , — — —	· 					

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed 1/06/09, have been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 - Indefiniteness

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants assert this rejection is moot with the cancellation of claims 6 and 12.

Examiner notes Applicants may have filed the wrong claim set as the claims filed 01/06/09 did not cancel claims 6 and 12. Because the claims were not properly cancelled, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heath et al (US 5,668,152) in view of Comford et al (AJP, Vol. 154, No. 1 (1999) 137-144).

Applicants assert the supporting declaration is sufficient to rebut an obviousness rejection, given the supporting data in the declaration shows the claimed compounds have superior activity in prostate cancer over structurally related compounds due to the

dual mechanism discovered by Applicants. Additionally, Applicants suggest the Examiner misconstrues the evidence and does not recognize the increased effectiveness against specific tumor cell lines, regardless of mechanism involved.

Examiner believes the showing is not sufficient to overcome the rejection.

First, Applicant's compound is specifically disclosed in the prior art and specifically disclosed to have PKC inhibitory effect, which the secondary reference teaches can be used to treat androgen-independent prostate cancer. Therefore it would be expected that the compound would have an inhibitory effect on androgen-independent prostate cancer and prostate cancer generally.

Second, compound 49 is disclosed in US 5,668,152 to have higher IC $_{50}$ values for the various mechanisms than compound 52 and would therefore reasonably be expected to have a lower apoptotic effect than compound 52. Further, the data presented by Applicant includes different IC $_{50}$ values than disclosed in US 5,668,152, such as PKCb.beta.1 which Applicant asserts for Example 49 of the prior art as 0.15 μ M, yet the prior art teaches is 0.03 μ M. Assuming Applicants data is correct further supports the assertion that the compound of Example 52 would have a much greater apoptotic effect than the compound of Example 49.

Third, Applicants present data based on in vitro assays, which presents unpredictable data. As illustrative of the state of the art, the examiner cites Suggitt and Bibby, *Clinical Cancer Research*, 2005, Vol 11, 971-981. Suggitt and Bibby teaches the unpredictability of treating cancer. Note however, that the current human tumor cell line in vitro screen is generally unpredictable. Modern methods are susceptible to false-

positive and false-negative results. (page 973 1st paragraph on right-hand column). Difficulty in determining results leads to difficulty in testing for effectiveness of compounds, which leads to unpredictability in treating cancers. Thus, the data does not provide sufficient information with regards to treating prostate cancer in vivo given the unpredictable translation of the evidence to the instantly claimed method.

Fourth, the data presented is not commensurate in scope of the claims. Specifically, only a single compound was tested, but the generic claims allow the R groups to be either H or C1-C4 alkyl. As suggested by Applicants, it is the variation of these groups from compound 49 of the prior art which causes suppression of the AKT pathway, but the data does not present evidence that the various substitutions will have the same effect as compound 52 of the prior art.

Conclusion

No claims allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/573,632 Page 5

Art Unit: 1612

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin Packard whose telephone number is 571-270-3440. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin Packard/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612